
Because the author feels that the Lord’s Supper as presently observed has little to do with eating and drinking outside the church walls, and that this is due to the fact that it is considered a sacrament, it is his purpose to demonstrate that the latter is not the case and that the Lord’s Supper is to be looked upon as a symbol that comprehensively takes in every aspect of human life. The book is arranged into three chapters dealing respectively with the questions why, what, and how men may eat and drink with Jesus. Two appendixes are added, the first dealing with the question “Whether Jesus Is Eaten in the Lord’s Supper,” and the second with the Leuenberg Agreement of 1973. The author has also added an excellent bibliography at the end.

In regard to the *why*, Cochrane’s answer is that “God permits and commands men to eat in order that they may come to faith and confess that Jesus is the Bread of eternal life and in order that their eating may be a sign and proclamation of his death. Thus Jesus is the justification and sanctification of all eating” (p. 31). In this chapter as well as in the others, the author tends to make conclusions which go beyond what the biblical passage states. For example, according to Cochrane, when Jesus asked a drink from the Samaritan woman this indicates “that Jesus is able to give ‘living water’ precisely by *becoming a thirsty man*” (emphasis his, p. 31). While his general statement is true that only as Jesus became man and one who thirsts it is possible for him to give the water of life, nevertheless this passage as such does not make this point.

The answer to the *what* is that man can eat everything (1 Tim 4:4). The Lord’s Supper was a meal that consisted of all types of food—meat, fish, bread, vegetables, fruits, and drink. So today it should not be limited to “a crumb of bread and a sip of wine,” but should embrace a normal meal with meat, fowl or fish as the usual main course. But he goes beyond this by developing a theology for meat eating. Recognizing that at the beginning and at the end vegetarian diet is prescribed, he affirms that “now that Jesus Christ has become the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world, now that the animal sacrifices in the Old Testament have been fulfilled in his death, now that the animal sacrifices in the Old Testament have been fulfilled in his death, now that they are seen to be signs and figures of his flesh, which has been offered up once and for all for the life of the world, all eating of meat is permitted and commanded as a sign of our sin and guilt, of our inhumanity, and of our forgiveness and reconciliation for Christ’s sake, and as a sign that we live solely from his death” (p. 43). Here again one questions the conclusion. Just the opposite would be expected: since sacrifices of animals came to an end with the sacrifice of the Lamb of God, meat eating which was not only permitted but commanded before his coming is now no longer necessary. We partake of the reality, even the Lamb of God.

The same type of fuzzy reasoning is seen in his statements regarding the eating of unclean foods. “Precisely because the blood of Christ cleanses us from all unrighteousness, we who are Gentiles need to confess the judgment of Israel’s law upon us, namely that in ourselves we are unclean” (p. 45). The
unclean animals are types of our impurity. It is right that we should consider ourselves as "dogs who eat the crumbs from their master's table (Mt 15:27). As we eat pork at the Lord's Table or in our homes, let it be a reminder to us of our impurity and of God's superabundant grace whereby we have been admitted to the covenant which God has made with Israel and which he has never abrogated" (p. 46). One would have expected the author to stress just the opposite—the fact that now all are clean, there is no Jew or Gentile. There is no distinction in Christ Jesus. What he says about eating pork is hardly an encouragement for eating it.

He finds one exception to the command to eat everything and that is eating flesh with its blood. But here again he has a *non sequitur*, for on the basis of this he states that this is a prohibition really against murder. But if this refers to murder then it is not a prohibition against eating and drinking.

In his last chapter, the longest, Cochrane deals with the *how* of eating and drinking and answers it briefly by quoting 1 Cor 10:31, "Do all to the glory of God." This is done when we eat and drink in remembrance of God's Son, but this *anamnēsis* is not an act whereby Jesus is made present. It is a purely human activity including acknowledgment, confession, proclamation, glorifying, and praising of God's work. The author sees the *how* in three aspects: (1) as an act of faith=Eucharist; (2) as an act of love=Agape; (3) as an act of hope=Marriage Supper. The Lord's Supper is eucharistic but so are all works done in the obedience of faith, that is, there is nothing in life for which we must not render thanks. As an act of love it involves our sharing of food with the poor and outcast. It involves political action to bring relief to the oppressed. It is also an act of hope in anticipation of the marriage supper of the Lamb when Jesus comes again.

In Appendix I Cochrane seeks to show that the Lord's Supper is not a sacrament in which Jesus is eaten, and that there are not two types of Eucharist, one joyful and one sad, but only one joyous meal. In Appendix II he points out his disagreements with the Leuenburg Agreement of 1973, especially what he considers the sacramental aspects connected with baptism and the Lord's Supper.

While the reviewer has pointed up what he considers weaknesses in the book, the efforts of the author to make the Lord's Supper relevant for modern man are laudable. He has opened up some new insights which will help in this direction.
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This is a collection of articles, mostly previously published, concerned with the question of the right translation of the message of Jesus and its proclamation in words and deeds for the present situation. Because the book